



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

precise temporal and modal force; that the clause as a whole is rather generalizing than determinative, and more frequently temporal than relative.

In undertaking to explain the origin of attraction Mr. Frank is less convincing. Attraction, he holds, is not merely a formal assimilation, but its beginnings are to be sought in sentences like *mittat quem velit*, in which, following Hale, the author regards *velit* as being as much a jussive as *mittat*—"let him choose his man and send him." But even if we admit the justice of this particular interpretation, one can hardly regard as parallels examples like *Bacch.* 656, *furetur quod queat*; *Hec.* 197, *di vortant bene quod agas*; *Bacch.* 674, *occasio fuit ut quantum velles tantum sumeres*, cited as illustrating the origin of the construction.

CHARLES E. BENNETT

A Primer of Classical and English Philology. By WALTER W. SKEAT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905. Pp. viii+101. 2s.

Philology is used here in its purely linguistic application, and in this case might have been replaced by Phonology, for all the topics chosen for exposition have to do with the relations of Greek, Latin, and English sounds. About half the space is devoted to the matter of vowel-gradation, and it is for its clear treatment of this subject—one that is of prime importance in Greek grammar and yet inadequately presented in our school-grammars, and one in which, more than any other, a comparison of English is helpful—that this little book may be warmly recommended to classical students.

CARL D. BUCK

Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae. Supplementum Sylloges Inscriptionum Graecarum. Edidit WILHELMUS DITTENBERGER. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. Vol. I, pp. vii+658, 1903. M. 18; Vol. II, pp. vii+750, 1905. M. 22.

In these two handsome volumes are published 773 inscriptions, a few of them for the first time, and many from out-of-the-way places in an ill-organized literature. We are thus presented with the historically important Greek inscriptions having to do with Alexander's empire, the kingdoms which arose from its fragments, and the provinces into which these were organized after the Roman conquest. The upper limit is Alexander, the lower Justinian. Vol. II is reserved for the Roman era. Dialectal inscriptions are admitted, but not *qua* dialectal. The work does not compete with Cauer's *Delectus* or Collitz's *Sammlung*. Metrical inscriptions are excluded, Kaibel having pre-empted this field. Total wrecks of weighty documents are rejected.

These are the principles enunciated by the author for the making of the collection. For them the reviewer has nothing but praise. None of them explains the absence of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, but for this there were, of course, good and sufficient reasons. The Latin original was here the indispensable thing—besides, there existed Mommsen's monumental edition of this, "the queen of Latin inscriptions." The lower limit, Justinian, is rather rhetorical, few, perhaps only two, inscriptions (II. 605, 420 A. D., and 610, 510 A. D.) being later than the year 400 A. D. The inscriptions are ordinarily arranged chronologically. Why this sensible plan has been disregarded in the case of those from the Roman province of Syria is not apparent.

The text, as in all of Professor Dittenberger's work, is unusually free from errors. Naturally the reviewer has been unable to verify more than a few of the many documents concerned. This test, however, was decisive. It showed how much cleaner Professor Dittenberger's text is than are the best of those in the archaeological journals. It is not often that blemishes like $\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\beta(\epsilon)\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ II. 521. 6; $\alpha[\rho]\chi\sigma\omega[\mu]\alpha\tau\omicron\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ I. iii. 8; 'Απολλώνιος for 'Απολλώνιον I. 100. 1; 'Αρτεμισίου ιθ' for ι[θ'] I. 224. 11 remain; and these are fair samples of the paltry things which escape the editor's eye.

Much care was required to select judiciously the most suitable inscriptions, and more to prepare so faultless a text; but when this was done the work had only begun. It remained to fill out the gaps in the stones, and to write the commentary.

In the first volume alone Professor Dittenberger has himself made upward of 500 restorations and emendations. His wide knowledge of epigraphical language and formulae, his keenness of insight and sobriety of judgment—the general sagacity, in fact, of his whole procedure—are so well known that it is hardly necessary to remark that they are displayed in these volumes also—displayed not only in what he has himself supplied, but also in the generous yet critical treatment he has accorded to the efforts of others. The training in epigraphical method to be derived from following Dittenberger through his many textual disquisitions can not be other than highly beneficial. Numbers 212, 233, 305, 326, 332, 335, 352, 441, 484, 629 show his handiwork to advantage.

The commentary has still to be considered. But why a commentary at all? The only collection of Greek inscriptions with which Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, and this, the supplement to it, can be compared is Michel's well-known *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*. Michel has given us no commentary. The practical expediency of this self-sacrifice is obvious. In one large, but not unwieldy, volume he gives us, for about one-fourth of the price, five-sixths of the 1,713 inscriptions which Dittenberger prints in his five volumes. The difference, it should be remarked, is not all due to the commentary. Dittenberger provides his work with

a magnificent index, presented for the *Sylloge* in a distinct book (Vol. III), for the *Supplement* in about 200 pages of the second volume. But the commentary takes even more space. Dittenberger's explanations are as concise and pointed as anyone could desire. But economy of room might, we venture to think, have been achieved by the use of a few genealogical tables—such as the one Strack has given us in his *Dynastie der Ptolemäer*—a few lists of kings, a few calendars of months. The correspondences of Macedonian, Attic, Egyptian, Roman, and other months need not then have been given in individual instances, and a similar saving might have resulted in the identification and dating of royal personages. Indeed, it would have been wise, we think, to have inserted such aids, if no other omission were made than to leave out a few badly damaged fragments like I. 168. But in any event the reduction would have been slight. An adequate interpretation of 773 inscriptions must bulk considerably.

The commentary is not perfect. It contains typographical errors—more of them, in fact, than does the text. The remarks on one inscription sometimes convey information about others which none but the continuous reader can find (cf. 71, n. 5). Once, at least, Dittenberger has repeated without change a defective section from the first edition of his *Sylloge*, namely in the case of I. 302-4. Eumenes I was assaulted in 172, not 171 B. C. Mommsen, who seems to be cited on this point, gives no intimation that all three inscriptions were inscribed at the same time, or in 172 B. C. Finally, after pointing out that $\dot{\iota}\pi\epsilon\rho$ is used to connect a dedication with a living person alone (I. 365, n. 3; p. 648), and that $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in an Attalid inscription invariably presupposes the death of the ruler to whose name it is attached (I. 291, n. 2; 332, n. 12), Dittenberger should have noted the collocation of both $\dot{\iota}\pi\epsilon\rho$ and $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in No. 302. I. 36 also seems to us poorly handled. For Merriam's identification of Sotion should be substituted that communicated by Wilhelm in the *Classical Review* XIII, p. 78, n. 2. Sotion announced the Soteria in Alexandria in the ninth year of some Ptolemy; Dittenberger, following Merriam, concludes that Philadelphus is meant, and that Sotion's mission was in 277/6 B. C. But Dittenberger himself has shown (*Sylloge* I². 205, n. 1; cf. also *Cornell Studies* X, pp. 23 ff.) that the Soteria were celebrated for the first time in the fall of 274 B. C. Some reconciliation is here necessary. What I. 56, n. 36, means is not *ohne weiteres* apparent. I. 90, n. 44 (also II. 654, n. 4) should be corrected by a reference to *Tebtunis Papyri*, § 103; cf. Wachsmuth *Beitr. alt. Gesch.* III, pp. 277 ff. For $\epsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota$, *ibid.*, n. 45, see *Tebtunis Papyri*, p. 34. Had some sort of a map accompanied I. 199, the explanations might have been reduced by one-half without loss to the reader. Sotion (I. 342, n. 1) and Dionysius (*ibid.*, n. 4) were priests of Serapis and epimeletes of Delos respectively in 110/9 B. C. (see *Cornell Studies* VII, p. 47; X, § 76). I. 395, n. 7, and

I. 222, n. 10 do not agree. II. 629, ll. 41–47 need a word of explanation. A reference from II. 771, l. 36 to I. 266, ll. 17 ff. would have relieved Dürbach of the difficulty he raised in *B. C. H.* XXIX, pp. 189 f. And other criticisms of the same sort might be made without implying that the commentary is other than what it is—a most learned, versatile and judicial interpretation of the texts.

The first volume pulses with the stirring life of an imperial people. The second betrays an almost aggressive acquiescence in the rule of Rome. The whole is animated by an intense human interest. Men great in many walks of life speak to us in the first person. The world of politics is illustrated in all its phases. We have the plausible elaboration of the greatest of Alexander's generals (I. 5), the quiet dignity of Sulla's letters (II. 441), the pathetic vanity of the Nubian prince who scorns the briefer title *βασιλεὺς* and proudly styles himself *βασιλίσκος* (I. 201). Whoever finds the public life of old Greece dull because it lacks the sentiment and intrigue which follow the participation of women in it can have no quarrel with the politics revealed by these documents. Here appears a girl-bride tenderly remembering—if paternal policy did not dictate the action—one bent upon the same adventurous errand as herself (I. 14). Here a queen-mother's loving care finds grateful recognition from worthy sons (I. 307). Here passes that amazing series of Cleopatras, first she from Syria, Antiochus the Great's daughter, who turned the old Egyptian court topsy-turvy and surrounded her young husband—the only son of an incestuous marriage who really sat upon the throne of the Ptolemies—with no less than six new orders of nobility; then those three daughters of adelphic unions who for fifty years disturbed the peace of two kingdoms and prove that physical and intellectual degeneracy are not always the result of such parentage as theirs; finally the last great queen whose fame is wider simply through the larger stage on which her life was played.

The subjects, too, have their place. Their acts are not so spectacular as his who placed an altar and wreath of ancestral statues upon a far-seen mountain top, and called upon his gods in broken Greek to remember his piety (I. 383 ff.), but they are none the less significant. Many adorations at petty shrines and imposing temples, many joys and anxieties because of divine epiphanies, many offerings from little congregations, are attested in these two volumes. The world becomes more and more filled with miracles till finally it contains almost nothing else. The devout are here, but so too are the publicans and the sinners. Tax-gatherers meet us in every quarter—on the caravan routes which lead in and out of Palmyra (II. 629), on the trails which connect the Red Sea littoral with the Nile (II. 674), the former sorting camel- and ass-loads of myrrh and oil, the latter collecting tolls from pilots, soldiers' wives, and lewd oriental women. We come to know the fiscal systems of great

nations, and the petty tolls gathered at ferries (II. 572) and brothels (II. 629, ll. 73 ff.); the organization of Roman corporations (I. 135; II. 525) and the illicit practices of Greek money-changers (II. 515); the cargoes which passed through the Hellespont (II. 521), and the pilfering of serfs by traveling soldiers (II. 519).

Finally, no two things stand out more prominently in the whole work than the power and prestige left to the Roman nobles and business men under the principate, and the extraordinary richness of the Greek East in statues and artistic monuments of all kinds.

Hellenism on its long road to Byzantium has at no point the homogeneity of Athenian culture. Bizarre and useful institutions stand side by side. Great actions modestly recited follow at the heels of vain-glorious self-commendation. The same priests who recommend the introduction into Egypt of the so-called Julian calendar authorize the deification of a still-born child. For curious contrasts this collection of inscription has perhaps nowhere its equal. There is material here for students of language and institutions, of religion and politics; in short, of human experience in general, which in this case is, we believe, none the less interesting to the historian because it issues, in the first place, from an extremely modern, and in the second place, from a decaying, civilization. We heartily commend these volumes to the attention of all who read Greek.

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

On the Syntax of Some Prepositions in the Greek Dialects. By
IVY KELLERMAN. Chicago dissertation. Lancaster, Pa.:
Privately printed, 1904. Pp. 79.

This dissertation discusses the syntax of certain prepositions of allied meaning as found in the Greek dialects. Chap. 1 deals with *ἀντί* and *πρό*; chap. 2 with *ἐπέρ*, *ἀμφί*, and *περί*; chap. 3 with *σύν*, *μετάπεδιά*; and chap. 4 notes peculiarities of various other prepositions in certain dialects. The writer's aim in chaps. 1-3 is to bring together through a complete collection of examples the various peculiarities, and to arrange them according to dialects and their chronological relation; to note instances of divergent usage, and those of agreement between the dialects and literary Greek; to discover cases of independent development and those to be regarded as an inheritance from early Greek; and by a comparison with the cognate words of other languages to establish if possible a relation with Indo-European. Though the scope of this restricted investigation is thus comprehensive and its method sound, the gain to syntax is not so great as might be expected, owing generally to a scarcity of